

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/810,679 02/28/97 HICKMAN

P ENVSP025BA

TM02/0410

PAUL L. HICKMAN  
HICKMAN, STEPHENS & COLEMAN  
P.O. BOX 52037  
PALO ALTO CA 94303

EXAMINER

DINH, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

08/810,679

Applicant(s)

HICKMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Serial Number: 08/810,679  
Art Unit: 2757

-2-

#### DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 21-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 21-31 of copending Application No. 08/798,704. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claim recite essentially equivalent limitations as follow:

Claim 25 of present application:	Claim 1 of 08/798,704:
providing a host computer ... running a host program	(line 9) a host computer coupled to said network and being accessible by said client computer ...
providing a client ... wherein input	(line 6) ... client program being

device of said client computers can be used to generate input to said host computers ... (claim 30) ... wherein events are placed in the host computer's event queue.	capable of transmitting event ... including input device event (line 12) ... receiving daid event data and placing said event data in an event queue of said host computer ...

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Claims 1, 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "PC-Anywhere" as disclosed by Stanczak "Symantec re-energizes remote-control computing" and further in view of Adams et al. US patent 5,913,920.

As per claim 1, Stanczak teaches a network accessible computer [a computer that run PC-Anywhere software] comprising:

a central processing unit and memory [inherent];  
an interface coupling to a TCP/IP protocol network  
[apparent since the computer can be access over the internet];  
wherein the central processing unit implements a host  
computer program [PC-Anywhere] to operate as a network-  
accessible host computer for client computers [remote computers]  
coupled to the network, wherein input devices of the client  
computers can be used to generate inputs to said host computer  
and such that image information generated by said host computer  
can be viewed by displays of the client computers [inherent  
function of the remote-control program PC-Anywhere].

It is not clear from the article whether PC-Anywhere sends  
display image to the remote computer in incremental changes. In  
similar art, Adams teaches to transmit screen updates only for  
region of the display that changes [see col.6 lines 45-57 and  
col. 7 lines 50-68]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one  
of ordinary skill in the art to transmit only incremental changes  
of the screen image because it would have reduced bandwidth and  
improved the response time.

As per claims 21-23, Stanczak discloses PC-Anywhere can be  
embedded into a Web page. Hence it is inherent that the system

Serial Number: 08/810,679  
Art Unit: 2757

-5-

can display the remote computer image in a browser as claimed and uses TCP/IP network.

As per claim 24, it is inherent the remote client has JAVA applet. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use JAVA applet to implement the remote client because it enable the client program to be cross platform compatible.

As per claims 25-26, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claim 1 above.

As per claim 27, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 24 above. It is known in the art the JAVA applet is download to the client viewing the Web page.

As per claim 28, Stanczak discloses using encryption.

As per claim 29, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the image once per time interval so as to control the update and prevent flooding the network.

As per claim 30, the recitation is inherent in the functioning of a host computer running the PC-Anywhere software.

As per claim 31, it is rejected under similar rationales for claims 27 and 30 above.

Serial Number: 08/810,679  
Art Unit: 2757

-6-

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park

Serial Number: 08/810,679  
Art Unit: 2757

-7-

II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor  
(Receptionist).

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dung Dinh", is written over a horizontal line.

Dung Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
April 8, 2001